May 20th and 22nd Evaluation Meeting
Questions and Answers

STATEWIDE EVALUATION

1. **For the statewide evaluation pilot test how will the survey assess trends of risk of pregnancy and factors that influence risk among Asian/Pacific Islander youth? Grouping all API youth into a single category may underestimate and overlook critical nuances/dynamics among this very diverse population. For example, risk for pregnancy among Cambodian and Lao/Mien youth is much higher than other Asian youth. It is important to assess differences/uniqueness within groups in API communities and not lump this group into one category.**

   We agree with you that there are important differences in sexual risk behaviors among Asian Pacific Islander youth that are obscured when surveys from "Asians" are aggregated for analysis. We will work with you to ensure that youth report their specific ethnic group, and capture those data in the scanning process.

2. **How long between Pre and Posttest?**

   The ***Teenage Pregnancy Prevention Program Evaluation Requirements Fiscal Year 2003-2004*** handout provided at the Evaluation Meeting on May 20 and 22nd, requires a pretest on the first day of the intervention, posttest at least 30 calendar days after completion of the intervention.

3. **If the great majority of teens said that they don't want a separate answer sheet, why are you still considering using one?**

   We are planning to use scannable booklets this year for the adolescent surveys.

4. **The UCSF presentation stated that the strength of the CCG evaluation was the large diverse representative samples. Why then is there an increase to 50 matches?**

   The CCG samples from *participants* in previous years *have* been large and diverse. However, some projects provide large numbers of surveys while others contribute less than the required number. The evaluation will be stronger if each project's sample size is the same size as the others and more representative of its participants. We also need surveys from non-participants for the comparative analysis.

5. **Do you think that some of the difficulties found in developing a universal teen survey have to do with the differences in populations served, i.e. low-level at risk vs. high-level at risk youth?**

   There are many challenges in creating surveys for the TPP program. They include the wide range of behaviors to be captured in a single survey, limited time to give the survey; age, gender, and cultural diversity; a range of reading levels; intervention diversity and related range of planned outcomes; and finally, widely differing local politics and sensitivities.

6. **When will the new surveys be ready for us to order?**

   The final version of the surveys will be ready in July 2003. Professionally printed surveys will be ready in August 2003.

7. **Will the nature of the statewide evaluation questions require "active" permission slips if the intervention occurs in a mainstream school?**

   The California Education Code requires *written* parent/guardian permission (positive/active consent) for youth under 18 to take a survey in school during school hours if the survey includes questions about family and/or students' beliefs and students' sexual behaviors. Positive consent is also advised for interventions that serve youth under 18 in non-school or after-school settings.

8. **What is the ethnic breakdown of population served through CCG?**

   Grantees describe their participants by age, gender, level of sexual activity (pre-sexually active, etc.) and ethnicity in the annual data summary form. The data for ethnicity were judged unreliable because totals by ethnicity did not match totals served; therefore, overall CCG participation by ethnicity was not included in the final report. Ethnicity was reported for youth who completed surveys.

Table 1: CCG Demographic Breakdown
Gender, ethnicity, and place of birth for high school aged youth who completed matched pre and posttests during the second funding cycle (n=21,152)

Demographics	Percentage of matched surveys at pretest
Gender	
Female	53% (n=10,751)
Male	47% (n= 9,535)
Race/Ethnicity	
African American	9% (n= 1,740)
Asian	9% (n= 1,793)
Latino	44% (n= 8,997)
Multi-Ethnic	10% (n= 2,101)
Native American	2% (n= 332)
Other	3% (n= 395)
White	18% (n= 3,598)
Born in the US	79% (n=16,025)

9. Please discuss the pros and cons of reading the survey or pre/post test to students.

The benefits of reading the survey is that for youth and adults who have reading barriers is that they can answer the survey more effectively and truthfully when it is read aloud while they follow on overheads or slides. The drawback to reading the survey aloud is that it takes more time to administer the survey. We strongly advise reading the survey aloud in groups where even a small proportion of the respondents have challenges with reading.

10. On the evaluation requirements for 2003-2004 Evaluation Meeting handouts, what will be the basis for the determination of who will have a tailored outcome evaluation? Will it be for all programs that implement an 8-hour prevention education curriculum?

OFP and the evaluation team will determine which projects will participate in the tailored evaluation.

11. Can the comparison group be the same group of students that will get the intervention?

Yes. Youth who are scheduled to take the intervention later in the program year can take the surveys in the summer or fall to serve as the comparison group. Then, another group of youth will need to complete a survey to fulfill the requirement to survey program participants. Strategies for obtaining a strong comparison group will be covered in more detail in future evaluation handbook and in future technical assistance meetings.

12. **CCG projects have continued to implement local evaluation outcomes. This isn't on the expectations handout; are we not to continue our local outcome objectives?**

    CCG projects are strongly encouraged to continue to implement their local evaluation process and outcome objectives for Fiscal Year 2003 – 2004. Projects should continue to allocate some of their funds for this local evaluation component.

13. **Could it be that regarding the word may be anomalous findings in the CCG study natural maturity of the teens being studied could lead to such results?**

    A comparison group controls for maturation. The anomalous result is most likely due to the relatively small sample size in the comparison group.

14. **Would the influence of such a maturity/maturation phenomenon be minimized by analysis using comparison groups?**

    A comparison group should control for maturation.

15. **Could we ask for a data file of all Vietnamese in your sample? If not the file could we get a report of the findings concerning Vietnamese especially the Vietnamese served by the VNCOC CCG program.**

    The CCG Evaluation Team provides "raw" data files to agency for local analysis in accordance with the protocol described in the 1999 Community Challenge Grant Program Evaluation Handbook. Aggregated reports of statewide results for specific ethnic groups can be requested. Please contact your evaluation liaison.

16. **Obtaining a comparison group for some interventions will be very difficult, for instance, if the intervention targets juvenile hall inmates or group home residents, how will we be able to find a group of teens that are really like the target group, but don't receive the intervention?**

    The comparison group will be used in the aggregated statewide analysis, not for individual agencies' interventions. However, the more similar your comparison group members are to your participants, the better for the overall evaluation. The evaluation team will work with you to identify a comparison group strategy that works in your locality.

17. **For agencies required to do a comparison group won't each intervention require a separate comparison group especially if the interventions target**

slightly different populations? Are all interventions required to have a comparison group?

No, you are not required to have a comparison group with all interventions. Please refer to answer to Question #18.

18. **Regarding the CCG Program Findings 1999-2002: What questions gave you the information "the number of sexual partners did not change"? "Abstained in the month before each survey" why not percentages?**

    "Number of sexual partners last month" was used to evaluate whether there was a change in the number of partners between pretest and posttest.

    The types of analyses conducted with the comparison group and reported at the Evaluation Meetings did not include percentages for any of the questions or responses; percentages have not been calculated for the data.

19. **Please reconsider the required match for those who must do 50 matches with 50 comparison; we would have to give 300+ surveys to come close to that requirement.**

    The evaluators will work with Projects/lead agencies to help them increase their response rates. One of the issues for matching surveys is that many surveys at pretest cannot be matched with posttests. It's better to survey fewer youth at pretest and follow up more diligently to obtain posttests from them. Having food as an incentive should help. For Fiscal Year 2003-2004, OFP will allow all projects to use their grant funds to cover food for the prevention education intervention as an incentive for participation. OFP will issue policy and guidelines on the use of food as incentives in the near future.

20. **Why is there no ethnicity information in MIP and CCG?**

    Ethnicity information for MIP participants was provided in the evaluation meeting handout, ***MIP Program Findings***. See question # 8 above for ethnicity information for CCG survey participants.

21. **In the pre/post statewide evaluation survey, what was the attrition rate (number of pretest to posttest turned in)?**

    Rates of participants who completed the pre and posttest ranged from 95% to 45%. Lead agencies that surveyed comparison group youth as part of the Evaluation Enhancement obtained even higher completion rates for the delayed posttest. It can be done!

22. **The graphic of a "devil-like" with horns clipart seems to indicate sex is dirty or part of deviant behavior can you delete this picture?**

The cartoon was included in the pilot posttest. Most youth really liked it, and appreciated the humor. Others were less amused. It is likely than any cartoon would be received in the same way—some in favor, some opposed. The point is to make the survey more appealing for respondents. We will look for other graphics.

23. In this extension year are there going to be more matched surveys required?

Yes, for Lead agencies with funding over $124,999, 50 matched surveys will be required annually. For agencies with funding $124,999 and under, 25 match surveys will be required annually.

REVISED Teenage Pregnancy Prevention Program Evaluation Requirements, Fiscal Year 2003-2004

Specific agency requirements for the outcome evaluation

• Implement outcome evaluation for curriculum based prevention education strategy for adolescents.
  ○ Strategy last a minimum of 8 hours
  ○ Pretest first day of intervention, posttest at least 30 days after completion of the intervention
• If TPP funding is less than or equal to $124,999 submit at least 25 matched surveys from TPP participants.
• If TPP funding is between $125,000 and $149,000 submit at least 50 matched surveys from TPP participants.
• If TPP is greater than $150,000 submit at least 50 matched surveys from TPP participants plus 50 matched surveys from a comparison group.
• Programs serving parents are encouraged to provide at least 25 matched surveys.

24. For the CCG what is the minimum quantity of participants surveyed required overall for abstinence focused to be analyzed as its own separate category and not lumped with another?

This information will be in the forthcoming Evaluation Handbook.

25. On the survey, sex has been defined only as "penis in vagina". It is my concern that it sends a message that oral/anal sex is not sex therefore acceptable although one can contract/transmit a disease from this behavior.

We would like to include additional questions about oral sex in the survey; however, we have concern about schools/school districts not allowing the surveys to be administered because of sensitivity to oral and anal sex. At this point we will add questions about oral sex and not anal sex. The questions we will be including are listed below. We agree with you that these behaviors have important health consequences that should be covered in comprehensive reproductive health education programs.

The definition for oral sex: Oral sex means one person placing his/her mouth on another person's genitals (penis, vagina or anus). (American Social Health Association).

- Have you ever had oral sex (A: yes/no)

- About how old were you the FIRST time you had oral sex? (A: I have never had oral sex: 12 years or younger; 13 years old… 18 years or older)

- In the LAST month, how many times have you had oral sex? (A: I have never had oral sex; I have had oral sex but not in the last month; one or two times; three or four times; five or more times)

- In the LAST month how often did you and your partner(s) use a condom to protect against STIs/STDs when you had oral sex? (A: I never had oral sex; I have had oral sex but not in the last month; less than half the time; about half the time; more than half the time; every time)

26. We are working with parents of adolescents in parent workshops four times a year; will we be required to produce 25 matched surveys since they don't receive 8 weeks of intervention?

If a Project only works with parents/guardians, and this is the strategy that will be chosen for inclusion in the Statewide evaluation, and the Project is funded at less than or equal to $124,999, the Project will be required to obtain 25 matched pre- and post test surveys.

If you survey adolescents, then using the Parent Survey is optional and encouraged. The parent survey is given for educational sessions that last at least 8 hours.

27. How do you match pre/post tests?

In the past, respondents' initials and birth dates were used to match surveys. Many matches were lost because youth wrote different initials and birth dates on the pre and post surveys. .

The proposed survey implementation plan will include:

- Pairs of surveys (a pretest and a posttest) with the same scannable individual identifier will be distributed to respondents.
- Respondents will complete the pretest.

- Each respondent will complete a one-page personal identification form that is attached to the posttest, and the survey administrator will collect the surveys.
- The survey administrator will hand the posttest survey to the correct respondent, or if s/he does not come to the group survey administration, follow-up with the respondent.
- The respondent will tear off and destroy the page with their personal information.
- The scannable individual identifiers will be used to match surveys.

28. Doesn't dosage affect outcomes? Is attendance in CFLE linked to surveys? Should we pursue participants who dropped out of the class?

Yes, dosage affects outcome. We have no way of linking attendance to surveys, except that youth who complete both pretest and posttest were likely at the first and last sessions. It is a general rule that youth who complete at least six of the sessions (80%) should be asked to complete the posttest.

29. Do you have a theory why use of contraception is lower among CCG participants? Could it be inconsistent teaching/information about contraception in the 8-hour curriculum?

At this time we don't have a theory on lower contraception use among CCG participants. It is possible that teaching about contraception was not consistent in the intervention sites, which may have had an effect on lower contraceptive usage. We have not yet identified a reason for the unexpected finding.

30. Do 50 matched surveys have to be from one intervention? Or, can they be obtained from 2 or more interventions?

A minimum of 50 matched surveys using EITHER the Youth Survey or Teen Survey is required if project funding exceeds $124,999. Interventions in which the survey is administered must meet the requirement for an 8-hour, face-to-face, curriculum-based prevention education and/or youth development intervention.

A project may implement the same intervention with the same target population at multiple sites, as long as the combined number of matched surveys from all sites totals a minimum number of 50 matched surveys.

A project has the option of conducting the statewide evaluation, using either the Youth Survey or the Teen Survey, for more than one intervention (defined above). The project must submit a minimum of 50 matched surveys. More details will be available in the Evaluation Handbook.

For the Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) requirement, projects are required to pick one (1) intervention.

LOCAL EVALUATION

31. Will the "toolkit" forms from the local evaluation activities be available on-line or on disk in an "Access" or other database format?

Each agency will receive a toolkit. The forms are included in the toolkit. Our current plan would be paper-based and then on–line. We are also planning on providing the toolkit on CDROM.

32. What will the different strategies (or toolkits) be besides prevention education for local evaluation?

The evaluation team will be working with OFP to prioritize the strategies to roll out in the next years. We are modeling the strategies after the TPP RFA issued in January 2002.

33. How should programs work with their local evaluators in the implementation and analysis of the new evaluation tools?

Programs vary by site, some have outside evaluators, others use internal staff. Program and evaluation staff should be working collaboratively to implement the process. There is no problem with involving local evaluators in using the tool kit, but sites must involve the local evaluator in the regional meetings.

34. Our project has an outside evaluator who helps with our local evaluation. What do you see as this person's role, now as OFP plans to provide more direct technical assistance?

For FY2003-2004, projects should allocate funds for evaluation. Please refer to question number 48 in the General/Administrative Sections of this document for guidance regarding amount to allocate. Projects are encouraged to set aside funds for local evaluation. The evaluation team will work with projects directly throughout the year, on a regional and project-specific basis, to assist in implementing the Statewide and Continuous Program Improvement (CPI) requirements, including planning for and tracking/scheduling a comparison group. However, the Statewide evaluation team will not assist projects in local evaluation activities. If a project needs to increase its capacity to input, analyze and report local evaluation data, the project should allocate some of its budget accordingly.

35. When will we receive the toolkit?

The current target date is the end of July 2003.

36. Can we include an outside evaluator for our 03-04 budgets to assist in local evaluation?

Much of this depends on the type of program (MIP or CCG) and your budget. This will need to be considered when you negotiate the SOW. Agencies who are or will be using outside evaluators will be required to have them participate in the evaluation regional meetings.

37. Must local survey matches be 8-hour curriculum?

Yes

38. Will ETR staff be available for TA with local collaboratives?

UCSF and ETR staff will work as a larger team, and their staff will be cross-trained so that they can provide technical assistance for both the local and statewide evaluations. Each UCSF and ETR staff member will be responsible for a smaller number of agencies, and serve as their evaluation liaison. Agencies will work with the same UCSF or ETR liaison throughout the year on both local and statewide issues. In the case of collaboratives that include multiple agencies, the evaluation liaison will work with the lead agency and develop a plan on how the evaluation liaison will work with the entire collaborative.

39. Once we choose a local evaluation option, what will we have to turn in to ETR/UCSF?

This depends on what tool is chosen. We are still finalizing protocols. More direction will be given to agencies at their collaborative regional meetings.

40. Does a program need to use the ETR local evaluation tool if they already have their own local evaluation?

We want all MIP and CCG to conduct one continuous program improvement tool from the local evaluation tool kit. We will work with each site to assess what they are doing with their local evaluation and determine how we can incorporate one of the strategies into the agencies' existing evaluation plans.

41. If our projects decide not to have a local evaluator consultant, will UCSF/ETR help us with data analysis on our local evaluation objectives?

No. See answer to question number 34.

42. Given that local evaluation will be used to refine SOW will there be an opportunity to "refine" throughout the year as opposed to only at negotiation time?

Yes. The tools that you'll be using to evaluation your program will provide information for you to use to improve your prevention education strategy. You will be required to work with your OFP Program consultant to negotiate changes to the SOW and program.

43. There are 4 agencies in our CCG collaborative does each agency need to participate in the local evaluation? If so do all 4 need to do the same evaluation or can they each pick something different to evaluate?

The Lead agency is required to meet the minimum requirements. It will be up to your collaborative to designate how you would implement the local evaluation.

44. Can you include a sample pre/post test on a curriculum in the toolkit?

Yes.

45. Do you need a minimum of 50 satisfaction surveys of each program component?

We are asking sites to collect a minimum of 50 satisfaction surveys from a population group of interest (not necessarily on every component or every population group served). Collecting fewer surveys can yield unstable data that are influenced greatly by students who provide extreme answers, making it more difficult to draw sound conclusions from the data.

46. What other tools are there to evaluate youth development and career development besides satisfaction surveys?

Right now we are targeting the prevention education strategy because it is the most commonly used strategy across the sites. We know that you are implementing other strategies as well. In the new funding cycle, we will develop other tools appropriate for strategies such as mentoring, peer provided services, or service learning. We do not have a timeline for the development or release of these tools, but development will be based on frequency of use across sites (e.g., if mentoring is used more widely than service learning we will focus on mentoring first).

Among the existing tools, sites can use satisfaction surveys, the program implementation tool and possibly the staff training and support tool (we may need to expand the items for the staff self assessment tool before they would be ready for use with other program strategies). We also will develop a process and tool template for conducting local impact evaluation; some of these items may be appropriate for youth development programs.

47. Why couldn't local evaluation be used solely and that data used for overall statewide evaluation?

The reason we can't rely solely on local data is because each program is unique and measures unique outcomes that match their local efforts. It is extremely difficult to compile unique information across 150 sites in a way that is compelling and uniform. We all share common goals of reducing sexual risk behaviors and enhancing protective factors. The statewide evaluation allows us to measure our progress in reaching these important goals. It also allows us to collect data across sites, which minimizes the burden for each site, yet still yields a large enough sample size to detect significant changes if they occur. More importantly, Legislature wants to see a uniform data set and still afford programs to evaluate their uniqueness and report local findings. We view the two types of evaluation as complimentary. The local evaluation allows sites to measure their local efforts and strengthen them as needed. This, in turn, enhances the overall effectiveness of the MIP and CCG initiatives, which we can assess in the statewide evaluation.

<u>GENERAL/ADMINISTRATIVE</u>

48. What percentage of our overall budget will be required to set aside for evaluation activities?

OFP projects may allocate up to 10% to 15% of the project budget for all evaluation tasks. The actual amount will be negotiated with your OFP Program Consultant in your SOW and budget.

49. Has California received notification that it will receive TANF in 03-04??

The Office of Family Planning has received notification that the full allocation of TANF funds for the CCG Program is available and is included in the State Budget. The authorization to spend the funds cannot happen until the FY2003-2004 State Budget is signed.

50. Could an agency provide CCG and MIP program at one specific site?

Yes.

51. Please explain the connection, if any, between MIP or I&E and links to federal match dollars for TSO. Does this mean TSO services must be linked to MIP or I&E or CCG or will there be a distinct TSO-only RFA released?

The Office of Family Planning administers the Family PACT Program. This is a federally funded Medicaid Waiver Demonstration Project that permits California to be eligible to receive 90 cents for every dollar spent. Since the I&E Program for FY2003-2004 has been proposed to be cut by 50% as proposed in the State Budget, it could be possible to restore the Program to full funding if we are able to link to Family PACT. Therefore, the I&E Program RFA will require the linkage to Family PACT.

52. **We presently have a CCG grant, can we apply for the I&E RFA?**

Yes, you may apply. However, if you are awarded I&E funding and apply for future TPP funds, agencies will be required to demonstrate how I&E Projects will be integrated into a comprehensive Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program.

53. **Will the survey process come under HIPAA?**

The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) does not pertain to the CCG, I&E, MIP and TSO Programs. None of these programs are defined as a health plan.

54. **For the 3 months that the PTC grant is not funded, will we be reimbursed for those 3 months if we are chosen for the grant?**

No. All currently funded I&E Projects will end June 30, 2003. The new RFA for I&E is planned for release this month (June 2003) through a competitive bidding process. We expect that by August 2003 grants will be awarded and by mid October-beginning November 2003, they should be fully executed.

55. **Will there be an RFA in the future that includes a tier 1,2,3 structure as proposed in last year's RFA Process?**

OFP intends to implement the Teen Pregnancy Prevention goals that were reflected in last year's rescinded RFA. However, due to the proposed budget cuts to the I&E and TSO programs for FY2003-2004, all OFP funded programs will need to be phased in to initiate a new funding cycle. The first program to compete for funds is I&E. The I&E RFA is scheduled to be released in June 2003(see Answer to Q#51).

The newly awarded I&E Projects will then be incorporated as Tier 2 projects under the RFA that is planned for release later this year. This RFA will also award Tier 2 funding for MIP and Tier 3 funding for larger comprehensive type projects, and will be on a competitive bid process. Should OFP be able to release an RFA for TSO, those projects will be incorporated into Tier 1 funding.

56. **In order to get ready for this next evaluation process, I'd like to clean up from the past UCSF evaluation efforts what can I throw out?**

Please discard all blank surveys and permission/consent forms from prior years. New materials will be provided. A new evaluation handbook will also be provided. OFP recommends that projects retain, at a minimum, evaluation reports and documentation from the last three fiscal years. For I&E projects, this would be applicable beginning July 1997. For the CCG and MIP projects, this would be applicable beginning July 1999.

57. CCG do we have data broken down by site?

Site level data from the statewide evaluation survey can be extracted from the overall database. Data can be provided to local agencies upon request, if sample sizes are large enough (minimum of 25 surveys per survey type per year). Data will be provided without individual identifiers. Please contact your evaluation liaison to find out how to obtain your data.

58. If we are still operating off the old RFA how is it legal to change the evaluation requirements from 25 to 50 matches?

In order to strengthen the evaluation outcomes in the next funding cycle, OFP has the discretion to change requirements, including the number of pre-post matched surveys required. OFP Program consultants and the UCSF/ETR evaluation team will work with you to redesign some of your project interventions. For MIP, there is a possibility for a small augmentation to support evaluation efforts. For CCG, we expect that projects should reduce/consider reducing the number of strategies to focus on the evaluation tasks.

59. Will CCG projects, which are funded at higher levels, have to maintain subcontracts in this extension year?

Your CCG program consultant will work with you to redesign your SOW. We realize that you will have to find resources to fund these evaluation activities. It will be up to the agency and program consultant to determine if there is a need to eliminate subcontractors.

60. Can we include food in our budgets as was allowed in the new RFA? Will the percent match change for contracts under $150,000?

Yes, food as incentives is allowable.
No, the matching requirements will not change.

61. If an I&E grantee also receives CCG funds through a collaborative sub-contract, how will our "friends" work with us to coordinate the efforts of each so as not to conflict with each others evaluation efforts?

The evaluation is a single unifying evaluation; the responsibility of evaluation falls with the lead agency, not the subcontractor. Evaluation team will work with agencies to facilitate this transition.

62. The federal government currently promotes abstinence-only education, is there likelihood that connecting federal dollars to prevention will bring abstinence-only requirements?

No, the state requirements are not like the federal requirements. There is no plan to emulate our State TPP programs like federal programs. Both Abstinence-Only and comprehensive sexuality education programs will be funded.

63. Is there a possibility we can link CCG to FFP match?

No, CCG is funded through federal TANF dollars. Federal monies from once source cannot be matched using federal funds from another source.

64. Will there be a regional meeting that will include all agencies to attend?

Regional meetings will be mandatory for the new fiscal year and subcontractors and collaboratives may attend.

65. Can you be a subcontractor on upcoming I&E RFA and still be eligible to apply for TPP RFA next year?

Yes.

66. Did I hear correctly that if we apply and are funded for I&E we couldn't submit a TPP RFA? Can you refresh our memory regarding tier 2 and 3 amounts of funds?

See answer to #48.
Tier 2 amount ranges from $100,000 to $150,000 and Tier 3 amount ranges from $150,000 to $350,000.

67. If I&E RFA is not out before the end of school, can we use previous school commitment forms from the last RFA?

Yes, we recommend you update the School Agreement Form to be reflective of the next funding cycle.

68. Can the MIP's get the evaluation findings on disk or emailed?

Yes, we will send the findings via email or disk for those who ask for it.

69. Is there an evaluation form for this workshop?

No.

70. Will the technical findings be put in written format as with the previous years?

Yes.

71. It was stated that we would be expected to downsize our programs, what guidance can you give? How much? Budget amount? % of budget?

Based on the new evaluation requirements, the OFP consultant will work with you to negotiate the SOW and Budget.

72. Is the term "program profile" interchangeable with SOW?

No, the "Program Profile" is a separate document. OFP will provide you with the form. This form will be submitted annually and will be part of your evaluation requirements to be completed.

73. Can we begin SOW negotiations as of Tuesday 5/27 or tomorrow?

No, once we have final approval on program requirements for each program OFP consultants will be notifying agencies to begin negotiations.

74. Is there a listing of agencies that are family PACT providers that can be made available in order for us to establish linkages?

Please call OFP for technical assistance. We will provide a listing of Family PACT providers in your area/city.

75. Would it be safe to say that all I&E programs should initiate activities t have their programs closed by June 30th.

Yes, I&E Programs will end their cycle on June 30, 2003. We will require agencies to complete their Fourth and Final Progress Report by July 31, 2003.

76. Do you have a date for the bidders conference?

The Applicant Conference will be conducted on July 2, 2003, from 9:00 a.m. to 12 Noon at 714 P Street Auditorium in Sacramento, California.